

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-24 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 3 and 4 are indicated as being allowed. New claims 25 and 26 have been added.

Claims 17-19 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

With regard to claim 17, neither Chang does not disclose or suggest,

... the processor, in response to the identifier, extracts a further portion of the EPG speech files corresponding to the identified location of the sub-section on the page, and sends the corresponding further portion of the EPG speech files to the audio speaker **without changing the text of the displayed page.** (Emphasis added).

Basis for this amendment may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0042], [0043] and [0049] of the specification.

Applicants' exemplary embodiment may display a page of EPG text files that includes a plurality of programs corresponding to 10:00 p.m. (section) on different channels (i.e. Channel 2-CNN Larry King Live, Channel 3-Fox Baseball, Red Sox vs. Yankees, Channel 4...). (Para. [0042]). The user in your invention may focus on a grid (sub-section) of the EPG data displayed. Alternatively, the user may focus on a further grid (sub-section) of the EPG data displayed. (Para. [0049]). For example, the grid (sub-section) may correspond to Channel 2-CNN Larry King Live. The further grid (sub-section) may correspond to Channel 3-Fox Baseball, Red Sox vs. Yankees, Channel 4. That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses "the page including a section, the section including a plurality of sub-sections," as recited in claim 17.

When the user focuses on a grid (sub-section), the EPG speech files corresponding to the grid may be extracted and presented to the user without changing the text of the displayed page. That is, the processor in Applicants' exemplary embodiment "...extracts a further portion of the EPG speech files corresponding to the identified location of the sub-section on the page..." and "...sends the corresponding further portion of the EPG speech files to the audio speaker **without changing the text of the displayed page,**" as recited in claim 17.

The EPG data in Chang et al. is extracted and displayed to the user, as shown at Fig. 5. The user is then prompted to select a program from the programs shown in the display at Fig. 5. After the user selects the program, additional EPG data is extracted which provides information for the selected program, as shown in Fig. 3. That is, the text is changed from the text displayed at Fig. 5 to the text displayed at Fig. 3 before additional EPG data is extracted. Thus, Chang et al. do not disclose a processor that "...extracts a further portion of the EPG speech files corresponding to the identified location of the sub-section on the page..." and "...sends the corresponding further portion of the EPG speech files to the audio speaker **without changing the text of the displayed page,**" as recited in claim 17.

Because Chang does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 17, claim 17 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Chang. Claims 18-19 and 24 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, claims 18-19 and 24 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Chang.

Claims 1, 10-12, 14-16 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang and Davis et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

With regard to claim 1, neither Chang, Davis et al., nor their combination disclose or suggest,

... (d) navigating through the stored portion of EPG speech files in the information appliance, responsive to the aural prompts, to extract the one section of the plurality of sections of the stored portion of EPG speech files and **to extract a further section of the plurality of sections corresponding to subsequent time interval;** and

(e) sequentially presenting the extracted one section of the stored portion of EPG speech files and the further extracted section of the stored portion of EPG speech files extracted in step (d) through audio speakers **without receiving a user input for the further extracted section.** ...(Emphasis added).

Basis for this amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph [0042] of the specification.

The user in Applicants' exemplary embodiment may be aurally prompted for the current time. After the user selects the current time (i.e. 10:00 p.m.), a section of EPG speech files is extracted. The section of EPG files may include a plurality of programs corresponding to 10:00 p.m. on different channels (i.e. Channel 2-CNN Larry King Live, Channel 3-Fox Baseball, Red Sox vs. Yankees, Channel 4...). (Para. [0042]). That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses "...navigating through the stored portion of EPG speech files in the information appliance, responsive to the aural prompts, to extract the one section of the plurality of sections of the stored portion of EPG speech files," as recited in claim 1.

After the section of EPG speech files corresponding to 10:00 p.m. is extracted and sequentially presented to the speakers, a further section of EPG speech files corresponding to a subsequent time interval (i.e. 10:30 p.m.) may be extracted and sequentially presented to the speakers. This further section may be sequentially presented to the speakers without presenting any prompts for the further extracted section. That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses extracting **"...a further section of the plurality of sections corresponding to subsequent time interval..."** and sequentially presenting "...the further extracted section of the stored portion of EPG speech files extracted in step (d) through audio speakers **without receiving a user input for the further extracted sections,**" as recited in claim 1.

The EPG data shown at Fig. 5 of Chang et al. includes a plurality of programs on different channels at a current time of 8:05 p.m. This EPG data is extracted and displayed to the user. The user is then prompted to select a program from the programs shown in the display at Fig. 5. A program is then selected by pushing a button, such as the CENTRAL CONTROL button 68, on the remote controller 10. Additional EPG data is then extracted, **responsive to the user input**, which provides information for the selected single program on a single channel, as shown in Fig. 3. Chang et al. does not, however, disclose extracting additional EPG data corresponding to a subsequent time interval. That is, Chang et al. do not disclose extracting **"...a further section of the plurality of sections corresponding to subsequent time interval,"** as recited in claim 1. Further, Chang et al. does not disclose sequentially presenting an extracted section **"...without receiving a user input for the further extracted section,"** as recited in claim 1.

The display shown at Fig. 43C of Davis et al. includes a plurality of programs on different channels during an interval beginning at 7:00 p.m. In order for programs to be displayed for

the next half-hour (a subsequent time interval), however, the user must press a button (i.e. left/right arrows) on the remote, as indicated by hint 422. That is, a further section that corresponds to subsequent time interval is only extracted **responsive to a user input**. Thus, Davis et al. does not disclose, sequentially presenting "...the further extracted section of the stored portion of EPG speech files extracted in step (d) through audio speakers **without receiving a user input for the further extracted section,**" as recited in claim 1.

Because neither Chang, Davis et al., nor their combination disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang and Davis et al. Claims 10 and 22 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10 and 22 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang and Davis et al.

With regard to claim 11, claim 11, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 11 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 12, 14 and 23 depend from claim 11. Accordingly, claims 12, 14 and 23 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang and Davis et al.

With regard to claim 15, claim 15, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 15 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Accordingly, claim 16 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang and Davis et al.

Claims 5 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al. and Oh. Chang and Davis et al. are described above. Oh is described in the previous response. Oh also does not disclose or suggest "...sequentially presenting the extracted one section of the stored portion of EPG speech files and the further extracted section of the stored portion of EPG speech files extracted in step (d) through audio speakers without presenting any prompts for the further extracted section," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15.

Because Chang, Hong et al. and Oh do not disclose or suggest the features of claims 1 and 15, claims 1 and 15 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Oh. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 15.

Accordingly, claims 5 and 20 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Oh.

Claims 6 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Van Kommer. Chang and Hong et al. are described above. Van Kommer is described in the previous response. Van Kommer also does not disclose or suggest "...sequentially presenting the extracted one section of the stored portion of EPG speech files and the further extracted section of the stored portion of EPG speech files extracted in step (d) through audio speakers without presenting any prompts for the further extracted section," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15.

Because Chang, Hong et al. and Van Kommer do not disclose or suggest the features of claims 1 and 15, claims 1 and 15 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Van Kommer. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 15. Accordingly, claims 6 and 21 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Van Kommer.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Cannon et al. Chang and Hong et al. are described above. Cannon et al. is described in the previous response. Cannon et al. also does not disclose or suggest "...sequentially presenting the extracted one section of the stored portion of EPG speech files and the further extracted section of the stored portion of EPG speech files extracted in step (d) through audio speakers without presenting any prompts for the further extracted section," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15.

Because Chang, Hong et al. and Cannon et al. do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Cannon et al. Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Hong et al. and Cannon et al.

New claims 25 and 26 have been added. Basis for new claim 25 may be found at paragraph [0043] of the specification. Basis for new claim 26 may be found at paragraphs [0044] and [0045] of the specification. No new matter has been added.


Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 3-4 are allowable over the prior art.

Appln. No.: 09/997,391  
Amendment Dated February 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of December 17, 2007

MATP-617US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5-6 and 9-24.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kenneth N. Nigon', written over a horizontal line.

Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549  
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/pb

Dated: February 28, 2008

PB\_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\PCBOCELLA\254539\_2.DOC